

Infrastructure Finance Committee: Cost Savings and Efficiency Work Group
Informal Notes from Karen – Edition 1
Summary of Process Discussions & Decisions - Tues, December 10, 2002

Introduction to these “Informal Notes”

From time to time, we'll be holding discussions and making decisions about our process as a Work Group and about our plans for a public participation process. These notes will be our informal way of keeping track of all we do in that realm. These notes will not document the content of our work – that's the responsibility of the meeting minutes.

So sit back, review the summary of what we did on Dec. 10th, send edits and editions to Karen, and enjoy the realization that no matter how efficient we may try to be with our forests, group processes will still put high demands on them!

Overview of our Process to Date and Filling in the Blanks

Using the handout that summarized the process to date, the group talked about:

? Accomplishments so far:

- See handout descriptions of meeting contents and outcomes for the previous 5 meetings

? Pending: Items to define for our process:

- Our definition of a successful outcome (see next section, below)
- Definition of “Efficiency for Infrastructure Projects”
- Groundrules for process and decision-making
- Design of public input process: what purpose? What tools and formats?

Starting Definitions for our Group Norms & Goals

? Process Guideline: Each Work Group member will function within the group's defined goals and the full group's process

? Goals: We'll develop a set of Work Group goals for a successful outcome, and measure our work against those.

Defining a “Successful Outcome”

Each person then created a description of his or her personal definition of a successful outcome for this Group’s work. Their ideas were clustered into these categories:

? **Shared expertise, Experience**

- Experience the fun of lending my expertise to help the process
- 40 years’ experience, over 65 subdivisions: Would be beneficial to citizens of Lincoln and future generations and family!

? **Civic Involvement, Positivity**

- Involvement and interest in community concerns
- Represent neighborhoods well
- Opportunity to help
- Be a positive member: to find a positive solution for infrastructure financing

? **Closing the gap, Finding efficiencies and cost savings**

- Resolve inefficiencies existing between City requirements and the Developing community: \$ and on time
- Importance of funding the gap for growth
- Try to see if we can save \$\$’s by working through the process
- The gap?? \$\$ or % saved to close the gap

? **Protect, Maintain Quality**

- It’s important to the City’s future
- To protect “things” that I feel are important
- To protect the quality of City services
- Find savings *without* loss of: Service, Function, Aesthetics

Participants felt that the top four categories could be turned into goals for the Work Group. But in addition, there were more items that people had in mind as expectations of this process, including very specific concepts (the “hard” items):

- Measurable life-cycle cost savings
- Making sure there are positive solutions: sustainable, friendly to older neighborhoods
- Identify and reduce/resolve inefficiencies, both within City Hal and the Development Community
- Validate or change City processes: evaluate why they do what they do, change if needed
- Don’t save money now and then pay later
- Define: Whatever we do, we do not want to suffer a loss of:
 - a) _____

b) _____etc

Designing a Public Involvement Process

Background Discussion

There was an extensive discussion on the scope and purpose of a public involvement process that this Work Group might want to sponsor. Some of the issues and questions covered included:

- Should we consider our Work Group broad enough to represent all the public viewpoints, or do we need to have a more extensive public input process?
- If so, is it up to our group alone to do this, or should it be under the umbrella of the Infrastructure Finance Committee?

Decisions

For now, tentatively plan two workshops:

? January 7th meeting: For this Work Group only

Purpose: Discuss, prioritize the “Ideas” list

? January 15th Workshop: For this Work Group only

Purpose: To explore priority ideas in depth, develop preliminary recommendations

? Late January/early February Open House: For the General Public

Purpose: To inform and consult with the public (see IAP2 chart on Levels of Public input) on the Work Group’s preliminary recommendations

Next Steps

? Revisit the process ideas at our Dec. 18th meeting. At that time, decide on our process steps and dates, and the scope and format of the public process.